

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Bernard Virtue [2Virt@npgcable.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 26, 2003 11:58 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** USF Change Unfair for Low-Volume Users

Bernard Virtue  
Tax Payer  
3194 Courtney Ave  
Kingman, AZ 86401-6460

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

September 26, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Bernard Virtue  
Tax Payer

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** Ben Brown [benjamin@ezwv.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2003 2:56 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Opposed to Change in USF Collection

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 1 9 2003**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Ben Brown  
56 Oakwood Rd  
Huntington, WV 25701-4129

October 31, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers.

Sincerely,

Ben Brown

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Athan Manuel [ariadnevan@mindspring.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 10, 2003 2:50 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** USF Changes Concern Me

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 19 2003**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Athan Manuel  
3803 Alton Place, Nw  
Washington, DC 20016-2207

November 10, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Athan Manuel

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** art [art@beehive.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 14, 2003 11:04 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Fw: Universal Service

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 19 2003**

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

----- Original Message -----

From: "Chuck McCown (laptop)" <chuck@beehive.net>  
To: <jeff@pulver.com>  
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2003 8:04 PM  
Subject: Universal Service

> Mr. Pulver,  
>  
> I believe it was you that told me that the nation and especially the  
> VoIP proponents should be committed to the concept of universal  
> service. If  
that  
> is truly your feeling and not just something spouted to get me out of  
> your face at USTA, then it should be addressed in your new magazine  
> (which hit  
my  
> desk today). (Congrats by the way, I think there may be space for a  
> targeted publication like this).  
>  
> You mention in your last page column (that is oddly called "Famous  
> Last Words" striking similar to "The Last Word" written by industry  
> icon Art Brothers for the last 20 years and is found on the last page  
> of America's  
> Network) that the incumbent providers are the same as the RBOCs.  
>  
> What an insult to the 1000+ ILECS in this nation. Many of which are  
> 75 or 100 years old. We are not RBOCs or BOCs nor have we ever been  
> owned by  
AT&T  
> but have fought long and hard to keep Ma Bell from stomping us out of  
> existence. Many RLECs were started by the first generation of  
> disruptive telecom entrepreneurs. Farmer lines, sometimes using  
> literally the top  
wire  
> of the barbed wire fence to provide party line service in rural areas.  
>  
> We bring broadband (yes even fiber to the home) to the farms and  
> tribes  
and  
> schools of rural America. We are committed to providing connectivity  
> that exceeds that of any RBOC/CLEC served area. But I detect an US vs  
> THEM attitude in your new trade mag. (THEM being the RBOCs and really  
> the  
whole  
> PSTN).  
>  
> I would suggest some guidelines that may help you understand the  
> difficulties that will be created by the regulatory agencies, RBOCs  
> and possibly the RLECs in the years to come:  
>  
> 1) RBOC= = BAD, RLEC= = Good (Rural Local Exchange Carrier)  
> 2) USF= = Good This gets DSL to the one room school house.  
> 3) We own the copper and the fiber and CO floor space. Don't piss us  
off  
> too bad.

> 4) Regulators need someone to regulate. They will get their fingers on  
> VON one way or the other. Figure out how to go with the flow as the  
> flow  
is  
> pretty large and you might drown.  
> 5) The flow of \$\$\$ between the IXCs and LECs and RBOC is a Byzantine  
> maze. Even industry insiders have a hard time grasping how it all  
> works. VON needs to carve a niche in this \$\$\$ stream, not bypass it.  
> Bypass = =

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Big  
> time attention.  
> 6) RLECs will quickly adopt VON, just show us how to not lose money in  
> doing so. The current regulatory structure helps us to stay in  
> business, even if we are not earning enough to cover our expenses.  
> Don't rock our boat or we will be at the legislatures, the FCC, the  
> state regulators, congress and every other regulatory body possible to  
> fight for survival.

We  
> do have clout.  
> 7) RLECS have fat juicy connections to the PSTN. We have OC-3 to OC-48  
> connections in many cases as well as SS7 and IP on DS3. We have  
> central office space, technical people, and lots of customers. I  
> would think some of the VON pioneers would welcome such resources that  
> we can offer to friendlies.

> 8) Somebody has to plow the thousands of miles of fiber through the  
> desert. And in doing so, fight the BLM, NPS, USFS, FWS, DOD and every  
other  
> three lettered agency that feels that public land (which most of the  
> West

is  
> made of) can only be used by viewing from outer space. We deserve to  
> receive just compensation for this effort. Your IP signal might be  
running  
> on my fiber. I think I should be paid.

> 9) We provide 911, 411, 211, 511, 611, & 711 services. I think some of  
> these are important. While it might be fun to make free calls, when  
> your kid is choking on their hot dog or is found floating face down in  
> your

pool,  
> suddenly your WiFi portable using Vonage doesn't have any value anymore.

> 10) Just because we can, doesn't mean we should. Reach exceeding  
grasp.

> Forrest and trees. Lots of platitudes can be clucked but if the VON  
> world is to be come a dominant method of communication, it needs to  
> mature and recognize the things of my enumerated list. Granny still  
> will want to

call  
> the grandkids on the weekend. Make that a reliable and low tech  
possibility

> for her. Don't kill the little RLEC that has provided her dial tone  
> for  
the  
> last 60 years.

>  
> I have no shortage of opinions.

>  
> Now you are a publisher. Are you going to be fair and balanced  
> publisher

or  
> just another single minded trade rag that only says the things that  
> make your advertisers smile?

>  
> Kind Regards,  
> Chuck McCown  
> VP-General Manager  
> Beehive Telephone Company  
> 2000 Sunset Road

> Lake Point, Utah 84074  
> 801-250-6639  
> 801-250-4420 fax  
> www.beehive.net  
> www.wirelessbeehive.net

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 19 2003**

**Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

## Stephanie Kost

---

**From:** Anthoula Manuel [fatballerina@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 10, 2003 11:11 AM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Note Regarding USF

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Anthoula Manuel  
330 Whitney Drive  
Fayetteville, NC 28314-1517

November 10, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Anthoula Manuel

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** Andrew Henderson [andrewhenderson@fusemail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 07, 2003 7:29 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** USF Changes are Wrong

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Andrew Henderson  
1655 E University Dr, Ste 3042  
Tempe, AZ 85281-8498

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

November 7, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Andrew Henderson



**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** Almus Thorp [almusthorp@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 10, 2003 1:59 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Keep The USF Fair

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Almus Thorp  
5602 gloster rd  
bethesda, MD 20816-2058

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

November 10, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and  
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Almus Thorp

**Stephanie Kost**

---

**From:** adamssac@wmconnect.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 20, 2003 9:40 PM  
**To:** KAQuinn  
**Subject:** Universal Service Fee Complaint

**RECEIVED**

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

<PROCEEDING>96-45  
<DATE>11/20/03  
<NAME>Susan Adams  
<ADDRESS1>6302 Parkway Avenue  
<ADDRESS2>  
<CITY>Columbus  
<STATE>GA  
<ZIP>31909  
<LAW-FIRM>n/a  
<ATTORNEY>n/a  
<FILE-NUMBER>n/a  
<DOCUMENT-TYPE>CO  
<PHONE-NUMBER>706/561-0439  
<DESCRIPTION>Universal Service Fund Complaint <CONTACT-EMAIL>adamssac@wmconnect.com  
<TEXT>

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room 8B201  
Washington, D.C. 20554  
(202) 418-1000 phone

Chairman Michael K. Powell  
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy  
Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin

Reference: FCC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD  
File No. L-00-72.

Dear FCC:

I am writing to complain about the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund and requesting that the FCC investigate this matter further before changing the current policy. Your proposed \$1.00 per month charge for all wireless phones will directly impact my ability to retain my wireless service.

I do not think it is fair to charge EVERYBODY \$1.00 dollar regardless of how they use their wireless phone, especially for a low-volume user that relies on wireless service for safety and security, not interstate calls. The current policy is fair, based on interstate usage, and should be left alone. Please do not penalize us. Keep this fair.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. Please provide a written response indicating the status/resolution of this matter.

Very truly yours,

Susan Adams  
6302 Parkway Avenue

CC: FCC Subcommittee Members